REMARKS

This Response is filed in reply to the Office Action dated May 18, 2007. Claims 1-31 were previously pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 15, 20, 24 and 31 were independent. In this response, no claims are amended, no claims are cancelled and no claims are added.

Applicants' silence with regard to the Examiner's rejections of dependent claims constitutes a recognition by the Applicants that the rejections are moot based on the Remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or a subsequent application. Claims 1-31 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action dated May 18, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bao et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0021393). The Examiner rejected claims 15-25 and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Avnet et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0094787). The Examiner rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bao et al. in view of Wall (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0027591). The Examiner rejected claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bao et al. in view of Avnet et al. The Examiner rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bao et al. in view of Walsh et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0050058). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the references as applied to Applicants' claims and traverse the rejections.

With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as to Bao et al., the Examiner asserts that Bao et al. describe a central controller and/or a player controller that is responsive to a user communication device operable by a user to select the content items for display. While Bao et al. describe that a user can upload information to, or download information from, the billboard [0028], Bao et al. describe such information as vAds, promotional items, vCoupons, vVouchers, vTickets, vReceipts and the like [0030]. In the case of vAds, Bao et al. only describe the user downloading a vAd or a portion of a vAd [0028]. None of the information that the user can upload or download allows the user to "select the content items for display", as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Since Bao et al. does not describe or teach each of the limitations in Applicants' claim 1, Applicants submit that Bao et al. does not anticipate claim 1. Accordingly,

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claim 1. Claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by dependency.

With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as to Avnet et al., the Examiner contends that Avnet et al. teach an apparatus for interactive media display. However, as Applicants have noted in their response dated February 28, 2007, Avnet et al. specifically recite that the display is static (pars. [0005], [0024]). The Examiner also asserts that Avnet et al. describe "causing sequential display of the items on a screen". However, the "series of posters" described by Avnet et al. are in fact a plurality of static posters each advertising one of the films being shown inside the theatre [0014]. Rather than a "sequential display of items on a screen", Avnet et al. describe static displays on a plurality of posters or screens. Thus, the Examiner's comparison of the display in Avnet et al. to Applicants' screen is improper, since the display in Avnet et al. does not display content specified by the transceiver. In contrast to Applicants' player controller, which specifies the content of the screen, the transceiver in Avnet et al. merely receives and transmits signals between the user device (16) and the central controller (14). The display is static and remains the same no matter what signals are transmitted. One of skill in the art would not recognize the display in Avnet et al. as an "interactive media display". Neither would one of skill in the art recognize the series of posters in Avnet et al. as a "sequential display of items on a screen".

As noted in Applicants' response dated February 28, 2007, each of Applicants' independent claims 15, 20, 24 and 31 recite an "interactive media display". In independent claim 15, the method includes "causing sequential display of the items on a screen". In independent claim 20, the apparatus includes a "screen for displaying content specified by the player controller". Independent claim 24 recites an apparatus including a "screen displaying the received content items". Independent claim 31 recites a method including "indicating, on a display screen, a plurality of selectable content items". As provided above, Avnet et al. do not provide an "interactive media display" where the display on a screen is interactive.

In addition, Applicants' claim 15 recites "displaying a new content item in response to the received command." As noted, Avnet et al. disclose a static display. The Examiner contends that Avnet et al. display new content in that the user can view additional text and information. However, the display referred to in Avnet et al. is the display at the user device (16), not the

display (20). Applicants' claim 20 recites a player controller that specifies the content displayed on the screen. As noted previously, the transceiver (18) in Avnet et al. does not specify content for display. Applicants' claim 24 similarly recites a "player controller receiving content items" and "a screen in communication with the player controller…displaying the received content items".

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 15, 20, 24 and 31 are not anticipated by Avnet et al. and allowance of claims 1, 15, 20, 24 and 31 is respectfully requested. Claims 16-19, 21-23 and 25-30 depend respectively from claims 1, 15, 20 and 24 and are allowable at least by dependency.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully suggested that the Remarks herein demonstrate that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly and based on the foregoing Remarks, allowance is respectfully requested. Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' Attorney if issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 6, 2007
Customer No. 25,181
Foley Hoag LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210

/Stephen B. Deutsch/
Stephen B. Deutsch, Reg. No. 46,663
Attorney for Applicants

Phone: 617-832-1118
Fax: 617-832-7000